



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

much of our time and energy to activities which have always seemed to me to lie rather outside of library work, the formation of clubs and debating societies, lectures and institute work, and story telling in the country schools. The average man or woman dwelling in an agricultural community is both busy and independent and unless we can persuade him that what we have to offer is what he needs or wants we can accomplish little. Nor can we approach the problem with any feeling of condescension or patronage. The idea that I occasionally find existing in the minds of librarians and trustees, that the people of rural communities will hasten to take advantage of an opportunity they have so long been deprived of, seems to me to be wholly without foundation. As a matter of fact, they are slow to seek of their own accord what they have for so long been able to do without. Tact and a knowledge of local conditions are necessary tools, together with a rigorous application of the golden rule.

The advantages of the county as the unit have been too well brought out in the earlier discussions of the subject to require repetition,—the disadvantages, as I know conditions in my own county, I have been unable to find.

The CHAIRMAN: The next paper is by Mr. FRANKLIN F. HOPPER, librarian of the Tacoma public library on

#### THE BASIS OF SUPPORT OF ORGANIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARY WORK

Taxation, a fundamental necessity for the maintenance of civilization, must in some form provide the chief means of support of public libraries. In spite of the universal aversion to paying taxes, there is no one act which can be performed by a community, which brings in so large return to the credit of general happiness, as the judicious expenditure, for public purposes, of a fair percentage of general wealth raised by an equitable system of taxation. At the same time, consider the multitude of services and the tremendous demands

for expenditure which are being forced upon local government by modern urban life. In a paper in the *Atlantic Monthly* for April, Ex-mayor McClellan stated that the gross municipal expenditure is increasing at the rate of 8.08 per cent per annum, which if continued will double in eleven years, and that the per capita cost is increasing at the rate of three per cent per annum, which, if maintained, will double in 33 years. He says that:

"Even under normal conditions, if the present rate of increase in the cost of municipal government continues, the tax on city real estate must ultimately equal its rental value. Of course, the moment that this occurs taxation has become confiscation, and the dearest wish of the pure socialist has been realized. The only alternative is retrenchment; retrenchment so merciless as to be beyond practical consideration until the pendulum of public opinion, having reached its collectivist limit, begins to swing in the opposite direction. Time alone can show whether we are on the eve of an individualistic reaction or whether the present collectivist tendency is destined to grow stronger and more widespread until it commits us to a policy of governmental activity hitherto undreamed of, and only possible of realization through repudiation of public debt and the confiscation of private property."

We must be awake to the tendency of the times, watchful that in the rapid social and economic changes the library is strengthened in its position in our civic life. There is nothing to fear for the library in a possibly ultimate socialistic society or in a city supported by single tax, but we must be on our guard. It is time we studied more carefully taxation in relation to libraries, the principles which underlie their support, discover their present status in municipal activities, and be prepared for the future.

Four chief considerations are naturally suggested by the topic, "The basis of library support," first, the reasons for asking for support by taxation; second, methods of effectively presenting budgets to appropriating bodies; third, principles which

govern the amount of budgets; and, fourth, means by which libraries may secure continuously progressive support in proportion to advance in efficiency and work accomplished.

The reasons why libraries are fully justified in asking and expecting adequate support from their public, whether state, county or municipal, have been so often fully discussed in meetings of librarians that there is no need for me to dwell upon them here. Ample support of free public education needs no argument, and it is simple repetition to mention the solid basis on which libraries rest in that respect. It does remain our duty fully and finally to *convince our citizens* of our complete justification. Our position will never be without danger until *every one* in the community takes for granted the value of the public library, and the first importance of its support as he does the public schools. Certainly such is not yet the fact, and we librarians are to blame. The so-called "leading classes," the large tax payers, are as yet merely tolerant, if even cognizant of the existence of the public library. We must prove to them the important factor which the library is in public education, the elevating and enriching influence which it should have on the character of the people, the economy which it is in the ownership and use of books, the increased value which it undoubtedly gives to property, the reduction which its existence probably causes in taxes necessary for the care of crime, the slight per capita cost, the value the business and trades of the city may derive from the efficiently administered public library. The work which the library commissions are doing for the people in small towns, in remote communities, for granges and rural debating clubs, is of the first importance in spreading broadcast the conviction of the library's value and necessity.

The presentation of budgets to most city councils or state legislatures is one of the things which make us librarians gray before our time. Fortunate is the librarian whose board of trustees, presumably a sympathetic body, has the power to levy

the library tax. Most of us must each year ask either for a lump sum or a percentage of the tax levy from the general appropriating body. Difficult as may be the task, I believe the publicity and the struggle work together for the good of the library. If our appropriating bodies are made up of the strong business-like men they ought to be, they will rightly demand full justification for the increased appropriations we are certain to ask. It is to be feared that few library budgets would stand analysis from the point of view of an experienced financial man. Our estimates for expenditure, for administration and books need more careful preparation. First, we must demonstrate that the library is efficiently serving the community in strict proportion to its resources. We are judged not by our promises to do, but by what we *have done*. The more efficient a city administration is, the more explicit must be our facts. We must show exactly what we have done with the money we have already had, and we must be able to demonstrate by comparison with other libraries of known efficiency in the same section of the country that the proportion of money spent for salaries, books, etc., is right. We must show that the cost per capita is attended by corresponding use per capita. I find that the idea of trained, expert people at the head of library departments appeals to business men. They know the value of efficiency, but we ought to be able to prove that our experts keep down costs and increase use; that the library receives proper return for the larger salaries paid. We should be able to show what it costs to run the different departments in our libraries. For instance, what are the costs for preparing books for circulation. How many of us know just what we pay for ordering, cataloging and shelving our books? Most of us do not care to know, for we realize we should be ashamed of the facts. We may never be asked for these figures by our legislatures and our city councils, but we should all of us be able to compare the cost of these phases of our work with those of other libraries. How else are we to know if we

are getting due return for the money spent and at what points the outlay shows the best returns? But no one of us is able to make any such comparison, because our bookkeeping is so bad and because we do not want to make it any better.

Professor Goodnow says, "perhaps no reform in municipal financial administration is so desirable as the general adoption of some effective form of uniform accounting, which shall be so framed as to make it possible to determine whether the administration of a given city is efficient." Can anyone doubt that the shoe fits the libraries? At the Narragansett Pier Conference, the Committee on library administration submitted an admirably simple form for an annual report, designed specially for the reports from libraries to state commissions. We have proved the value of this form and particularly of its classification of expenditures, but surely the time has come when the American library association needs to adopt and recommend to all libraries a more detailed form for expenditures and for circulation statistics, perhaps two forms, one for the larger and one for the smaller libraries. We have standardized our catalogs, our charging systems, our mechanical contrivances, our assistants, and our own qualifications until we are all so standard we bore one another; but two things which need standardizing as much as any, we have pretty completely overlooked. May we not reasonably hope that some committee of the association, perhaps working with an expert accountant familiar with our requirements, will devise a scheme of accounts which will help us to know where we are extravagant and where stingy, to compare our own costs with those of our neighbors. We are neither businesslike nor sensible until we keep our books in such a way that comparisons can easily be made. The suggestion of the secretary of the A. L. A. in the last number of the Bulletin for reporting and tabulating various library statistics is admirable. As to circulation statistics, a word later.

In considering our library expenditures, it may be of some profit to study the re-

cently issued fifth bulletin of the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching, giving results of investigations into what the author considers the extravagant and unsystematic administration of our colleges. Prof. Bushnell's acute criticism in the Atlantic of the standards and arguments presented in the bulletin is perhaps equally illuminating. Certainly the "student-per-foot-per-hour" or the "circulation-per-diem-per-dollar" standards are not the only measures of college or library efficiency.

To return to the presentation of budgets: The average city official will do what he believes to be his duty by the library, but the demands for appropriations for many municipal enterprises are insistent, and we must never for an instant let him *forget* his duty to the library. Of great value are tables and diagrams of increases in number of volumes and circulation, percentages of increase in appropriations for the different city departments, in population, in valuation of property; such tables as we find in the last report of the Seattle public library. It pays to keep councilmen interested throughout the year, not only at the time for appropriations. Much depends on the personal relations between librarians and councilmen, even more, I think, than between board and councilmen.

Influential men of the city, who have no official connection with the library, should see the councilmen in its behalf. Appropriating bodies take it for granted that boards of trustees and librarians are interested to the point of bias, but it is another story to have leading business men talk library to them. Personally I believe that women's suffrage is a tower of strength for a library. There is no force so potent for civic betterment as the women's clubs as they are conducted on the Pacific coast. They interest themselves actively in the best things, and I know from experience the wonderful work they can and will do for library efficiency. Powerful as were the women's clubs before women were enfranchised, they are to-day, in the state of Washington at least, holding the balance

of the power. May I also say that I personally believe the presence of women on library boards is of great importance, particularly where women's suffrage exists. The increased ease with which appropriations are secured from city councils when women members of the board appear before them is a sidelight worth notice. All over the country the Socialist party is gaining strength. Socialists stand for liberal appropriations to public institutions, good salaries and efficient administration. Remember that they will work for us if we prove to them our cause is just.

The principles which govern the amount of money libraries are justified in expecting for their maintenance have received little systematic investigation. My brief study and tentative conclusions I venture to consider merely an introduction to the subject.

Given two cities, each having 100,000 inhabitants, other things being equal, a public library in one city should do as much work and be of as much service as the other. It should be possible to measure in terms of use the normal efficiency of either library. It is safe to say that our first factor in determining the extent of work is population. But one city is prosperous, progressive, the other is not; one has a high property valuation, the other is poor. The former city can consequently afford to spend more for its public library. The library in the latter city will as nearly as possible approximate the service and use of that in the former city, and it can serve only in proportion as the means for service are provided. The second factor in determining our budgets is the amount of taxable property in the city and the income it will produce. Under present conditions, one ought also to take into consideration city income from licenses, police court fines, etc. Single tax would remedy this complexity. These then are the two chief factors in our budgets, first, population and library service per capita; and, second, property values. But other factors everywhere must be considered; as the location of the city, the character of the population (as in the South

the use per capita will be reduced by the non-reading negro population), the density of population, affecting the number of branch buildings (which inevitably increase per capita cost), the special and endowed libraries which tend to reduce per capita use and also per capita cost, the plans of our library buildings, making great differences in the cost of administration. You say we cannot all fully consider all these factors; we take what we can get. Yes, but that is neither science nor business. Perhaps if we subject our budgets to scientific and business tests, what we get will more approximate our needs. Someone may say, "All these factors of character of population, character of buildings and so on, completely alter my special problems." *Do they alter the problem more than they do that of the public schools?* The basis of support for the public school systems varies in almost as many ways as there are states, but school authorities have given the subject careful thought, and the foundation principles which they seem to be actually accepting are illustrated by the practice of some of the most advanced states. There seems to be a double basis for maintenance (buildings are a separate consideration). First, a per capita basis; that is the number of children of school age in the state. A state tax is levied to produce say \$10 per child. That gives a distinct and equitable foundation for every district of the commonwealth. But the character of the counties varies, so the county commissioners are instructed by law to levy a county tax which will produce up to a certain amount for each child of school age, say again \$10. These two levies will produce in the maximum, say \$20. There is *another* basis in which one takes into consideration primarily property values and such other local factors as were referred to above. Local school boards decide how much the local property can stand for school purposes in addition to the two tax levies already mentioned; just what are the local characteristics which cause the problem to vary; and they then make whatever additional levy is necessary to meet the needs. You will

observe that the law in so far as it applies to the state and county tax provides an automatic increase in the total income in proportion to the increase in the number of children of school age. The office and travelling expenses of the state boards of education are provided by direct appropriations by the legislature. Now, it seems to me the conclusions of those states which have either adopted or are working toward the plan just outlined are suggestive as a basis of support for libraries. The population which the public schools consider is the number of children of school age; the population which librarians have to consider is the *total* population. The schools do not reach all their population; and certainly the libraries do not reach nearly as large a percentage of theirs, but the difference is not in *kind*, but one of degree only, and that difference will gradually disappear as our libraries grow in efficiency. The organization towards which the public libraries in many of the states are tending seems to be roughly about as follows:

(1) A strong central library system consisting of commission and state library, supplying the rural districts, district schools and the small towns with library facilities, organizing new libraries, and in addition acting as the central library storehouse on the lines of the New York State library whose collection was so recently destroyed.

(2) A county library system, supplying the needs of every nook and corner of the counties. To support this dual system, a state tax might be levied, which would produce a certain sum for the service the commission should render to every inhabitant not served by the county libraries, and in case an efficient county organization exists, making it unnecessary for the commission to act, the amount raised for state tax for such a county could be paid over to the proper county library board. It should be possible to find a unit of per capita cost varying of course in different states in proportion to property valuation and other factors. Such a cost unit once discovered could be embodied in

state law and the revenue would accordingly increase with the increase in population to be served. In this way a certain minimum amount would come automatically to every public library organization in the state, directly proportional to the population to be served. In addition each county should be empowered to levy a tax for libraries which would produce enough to meet estimated expenses. The millage of the state tax would vary with the number of people to be served; the millage of the county tax would either remain the same from year to year, thus producing additional revenue as the county property valuations increase, or it would vary between certain maximum and minimum limits, the degree of variation to be decided by the appropriating bodies. So we would have a dual basis of support, one a definite minimum income for the service of each person whom it is our duty to serve, and the other the additional income increasing or diminishing with property valuations. Under the present conditions it is possible for a municipal library partially to adopt some such method by determining what a fair cost per capita would be, taking into consideration local conditions and comparison with other libraries. Once having determined such cost per capita, it is easy to find what millage of the tax levy would produce the total amount. Even if such millage is not prescribed by state law or city charter, it is not difficult to accustom an appropriating body to consider a certain rate of tax on property as the proper amount to appropriate each year. Until the relationship between state commissions and state libraries becomes what it is eventually likely to become, one organization working for all the people of the state, it will be difficult to work out a proper basis of support for these state institutions, but as the organization is gradually perfected, it seems that it will become more and more easy to determine the proper method of their support by some form of combination of the per capita and the property valuation bases.

A corporation determines each year the degree of its success or failure by the re-

# I. STATISTICS OF CITIES HAVING A POPULATION

City.	Population. 1910.	Assessed Valuation of Property. 1910.	Property Assessed at.	Property Value at 100%.	Library Income from Taxes. 1910.	Library Income from All Other Sources, Except Endowments. 1910.	Library Income from All Sources, Except Endowments. 1910.
Albany, N. Y.....	100,253						
Allegheny, Pa.....	132,283	\$100,000,000.00 (approximate)	90 %	\$111,111,111.00 (approximate)	\$26,862.00	Fines, etc. not reported	\$26,862.00
Atlanta, Ga.....	154,839	Insufficient report.					
Baltimore, Md.....	558,485	Unusual part of income from building.		endowments; so omitted.	\$50,000	from endowment; \$20,000	from city.
Birmingham, Ala.....	132,685	New library.	No	no support.			
Boston, Mass.....	670,585	1,393,765,423.00	100 %	1,393,765,423.00	351,978.00	Fines, etc. not reported	351,978.00
Bridgeport, Conn.....	102,054	No report.					
Brooklyn, N. Y.....	1,634,351	1,463,368,346.00	100 %	1,463,368,346.00	424,739.00	\$26,111.94	450,850.94
Buffalo, N. Y.....	423,715	307,300,585.00	75 %	409,734,113.00	99,950.00	8,188.60	108,138.60
Cambridge, Mass.....	104,839	No report.			Year ending July 1, 1910.	Year ending July 1, '10.	
Chicago, Ill.....	2,185,283	848,994,536.00	33 %	25,727,107,151.00	328,729.90	Fines, etc. not reported	328,729.90
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	364,463	306,973,240.00	60 %	511,612,266.00	149,312.47	6,191.53	155,504.00
(County Library)		(Hamilton County)					
Cleveland, Ohio.....	560,663	274,970,605.00	35 %	785,621,300.00	253,574.38	15,595.01	269,169.39
Columbus, Ohio.....	181,548	No report.					
Dayton, Ohio.....	116,577	62,631,280.00	45 %	139,180,622.00	23,041.98	Fines, etc. not reported.	23,041.98
Denver, Colo.....	213,381	132,909,000.00	50 %	265,818,000.00	30,000.00	3,000.00	33,000.00
Detroit, Mich.....	465,766	377,335,980.00	100 %	377,335,980.00	104,717.86	11,513.00	116,230.86
Fall River, Mass.....	119,295	92,488,520.00	100 %	92,488,520.00	26,134.04	6,329.97	32,464.01
Grand Rapids, Mich.....	112,571	85,324,200.00	100 %	85,324,200.00	34,129.63	7,625.52	41,755.15
Indianapolis, Ind.....	233,650	135,966,655.00 (real est.)	60 %	226,611,090.00	71,860.00	2,534.11	74,394.11
Jersey City, N. J.....	267,779	No report.					
Kansas City, Mo.....	248,381	No regular appropriation.	Supported from school funds.				
Los Angeles, Cal.....	319,198	332,489,169.00	50 %	664,978,300.00	132,775.00	4,034.55	136,809.55
Louisville, Ky.....	223,928	165,000,000.00	80 %	206,250,000.00	60,557.68	4,178.00	64,735.68
Lowell, Mass.....	106,294	No report.					
Memphis, Tenn.....	131,105	93,445,488.00	60 %	155,742,480.00	26,000.00	Fines, etc. not reported.	26,000.00
Milwaukee, Wis.....	373,857	Valuation figures incorrect.					
Minneapolis, Minn.....	301,408	No report.					
Nashville, Tenn.....	110,364	76,023,612.00	80 %	95,029,515.00	15,000.00	798.47	15,798.47
New Haven, Conn.....	133,605	Insufficient data.					
New Orleans, La.....	339,075	No report.					
New York, N. Y.....	2,848,491	5,613,546,713.00	100 %	5,613,546,713.00	620,812.00	34,834.06	655,646.06
(Including Manhattan, The Bronx and Richmond)							
Newark, N. J.....	347,469	348,105,216.00	100 %	348,105,216.00	109,308.00	11,373.00	120,681.00
Oakland, Cal.....	150,174	Insufficient data.					
Omaha, Neb.....	124,096	28,607,002.00	20 %	143,035,010.00	29,000.00	1,500.00	30,500.00
Patterson, N. J.....	125,600	No report.					
Philadelphia, Pa.....	1,549,008	1,458,851,880.00	65 %	2,244,387,507.00	234,600.00	3,000.00 (?)	237,600.00
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	401,622	709,905,761.00	90 %	788,784,167.00	225,000.00		225,000.00
(excluding Allegheny)							
Portland, Ore.....	207,214	231,161,600.00 (City)	75 %	308,215,333.00 (City)	61,822.30	2,932.00	64,754.30
Providence, R. I.....	224,326	301,823,650.00 (Co.)	100 %	402,431,533.00 (Co.)	Only small part of funds come from city.	Information not full enough for comparison.	
Queens Borough.....	284,041	259,145,060.00	100 %	259,145,060.00	120,207.00		
Richmond, Va.....	127,628	339,922,440.00	100 %	339,922,440.00			
Rochester, N. Y.....	218,149	No public library.					
St. Louis, Mo.....	687,029	No public library.					
St. Paul, Minn.....	214,744	564,875,720.00	65 %	869,039,500.00	212,137.22	\$10,000 fines, etc. (approx.)	222,137.22
San Francisco, Cal.....	416,912	492,329,885.00	60 %	820,549,816.00	74,309.35	\$27,000 (rent)	
Scranton, Pa.....	129,867	74,354,445.00	75 %	99,139,260.00	18,300.00	3,000 (fines etc.)	59,000.00
Seattle, Wash.....	237,194	185,317,470.00	45 %	411,816,600.00	99,555.43a	\$30,000 approx.	83,678.45
Spokane, Wash.....	104,402	85,619,405.00	40 %	142,698,800.00	28,481.04		19,177.07
Syracuse, N. Y.....	137,249	105,498,527.00	100 %	105,498,527.00	39,200.00	46,982.82	146,538.25
Toledo, Ohio.....	168,497	83,002,450.00	60 %	138,337,410.00	27,764.27	1,354.72	29,835.76
Washington, D. C.....	331,069	Disregarded, because the figures are inadequate for purposes of comparison, more than 50 % of the real es					
Worcester, Mass.....	145,986	141,212,607.00	100 %	141,212,607.00	44,000.00	683.75	39,833.75
Averages.....						27,764.27	72,764.27

\*This is the gross income; the city keeps \$9,000 each year, towards interest and sinking fund charges on the building.

\*\*Including levy for the \$9,000.

a \$99,555.43 is actual receipts from taxes in 1910. The estimated receipts from taxes in 1910 would have been \$93,492.66 based on a library  
 † The figures given for library income from taxes in 1910 do not always exactly correspond with the result obtained by multiplying assessed v  
 collected, etc.

# **S HAVING A POPULATION OF MORE THAN 100,000**

Library Income from All Other Sources, Except Endowments, 1910.	Library Income from All Sources, Except Endowments, 1910.	Rate of Levy in Mills in 1910, Based on Assessed Valuation.	Rate of Levy in Mills in 1910, Based on Valuation of 100%.	Rate of Levy in Mills Based on Valuation of 100% Which would produce Total Income from All Sources, Except Endowments, 1910.	Income per Capita, Except from Endowment, 1900.	Income per Capita, Except from Endowment, 1910.	Circulation for Home Use per Capita, 1900.	Circulation for Home Use per Capita, 1910.	Income per Circulation, 1910.
Fines, etc. not reported from endowment; \$20,000	\$26,862.00	3/11	.24	.24	\$0.154	\$0.203	.86	1.17	\$0.158
Fines, etc. not reported \$26,111.94	351,978.00	.254 (lumpsum)	.254	.254	.518	.524	2.36	2.38	.219
8,188.60	450,850.94	.29	.29	.30	.03	.275	.54	2.48	.11
Year ending July 1, '10.	108,138.60	.32 (lump sum)	.24	.26	.24	.25	2.5	3.2	.078
Fines, etc. not reported 6,191.53	328,729.90	.411	.135	.127	.15	.122	.82	.92	.16
15,595.01	155,504.00	.5	.29	.33	.18	.426	1.25	2.93	.114
Fines, etc. not reported.	269,169.39	1.5 (?)			.18	.48	2.51	3.99	.12
3,000.00	23,041.98	.4	.180	.180	.16	.19	1.57	2.38	.083
11,513.00	33,000.00	.23 (lump sum)	.115	.12	.205	.155	2.74	1.73	.089
6,329.97	116,230.86	.25	.25	.36	.19	.25	1.71	1.78	.14
7,625.52	32,464.01	.28 (lump sum)	.28	.36	.154	.27	1.59	1.68	.17
2,534.11	41,755.15	.4	.4	.48	.37	.37	2.11	2.73	.136
4,034.55	74,394.11	.4	.31	.32	.35				
4,178.00	136,809.55	.4	.20	.205	.26	.42	3.5	2.13	.20
Fines, etc. not reported.	64,735.68	.325	.29	.31	.28	.28	No library then.	2.74	.10
798.47	26,000.00	.3	.16	.16	.051	.19	.5	1.6	.12
34,834.06	15,798.47	.19	.15	.16	.103	.14	No record.	1.32	.107
11,373.00	655,646.06	.11	.11	.116		.23	1.33	2.64	.08
1,500.00	120,681.00	** .33 1/2	** .33 1/2	** .34	.18	.347	1.3	2.7	.129
3,000.00 (?)	30,500.00	1.01	.20	.21	.161	.24	2.2	2.91	.11
2,932.00	237,600.00	.16	.104	.105	.127	.15	1.41	1.17	.13
rt of funds come from city.	225,000.00	.32	.288	.288	.28	.56	1.33	2.8	.19
Information not full enough for comparison.	64,754.30	.26	.19	.20		.312	Not established as public library.	2.66	.117
\$10,000 fines, etc. (approx.)	222,137.22	.4	.24	.25	.134	.323	1.23	2.49	.129
\$27,000 (rent)	59,000.00	.23 (lump sum)	.14	.282	.09	.279	1.01	1.73	.15
3,000 (fines etc.)	83,678.45	.15	.094	.119	.105	.20	1.861	1.726	.116
\$30,000 approx.	19,177.07	.246 (lump sum)	.18	.19	.12	.147	1.08	.94	.156
9,369.10	146,538.25	.5045	.227	.355	.17	.617	1.91	2.74	.225
877.07	29,835.76	.437	.19	.208	.207	.286	.88	2.04	.139
46,982.82	39,883.75	.37 (lump sum)	.37	.38	.21	.363	1.5	1.8	.155
1,354.72	27,764.27	.35	.21	.21	.13	.164	1.68	2.23	.074
683.75	% of the real estate being exempt from taxation.								
Fines, etc. not reported.	50,538.22	.31 (lump sum)	.31	.35	.34	.346	1.7	2.2	.134
comparison, more than 50									
6,538.22									
.....		.3625	.218	.26	.178	.29	1.617	2.187	.133

s on the building. Increase from 1900 to 1910 62% 35%  
 would have been \$93,492.66 based on a library levy of .5045 mills and an assessed valuation of \$185,317,470.00.  
 the result obtained by multiplying assessed valuation by rate of levy. The difference is usually caused by receipts from overdue taxes, taxes not



## II. STATISTICS FROM ELEVEN SMALL

City	Population. 1910.	Assessed Valuation of Property. 1910.	Property Assessed at.	Property Value at 100 %.	Library Income from Taxes. 1910.	Library Income from All Other Sources, Except Endowments. 1910.	Library Income from All Sources, Except Endowments. 1910.
Brookline, Mass.....	27,792				\$23,500.00(?)	Fines etc. not reported.	\$23,500.00
Cedar Rapids.....	32,811	\$25,000,000.00	100 %	\$25,000,000.00	10,916.92	\$1,720.12	13,637.04
Duluth, Minn.....	78,466	41,385,224.00	33 1/3 %	124,155,672.00	14,652.31	683.05	15,335.36
Elizabeth, N. J.....	73,409	57,408,430.00	100 %	57,408,430.00	17,335.00		17,355.00
Erie, Pa.....	66,525	25,254,803.00	40 %	63,137,000.00	15,050.00		15,050.00
Jackson, Mich.....	31,433	20,000,000.00	100 %	20,000,000.00	10,000.00	500.00	10,500.00
Lynn, Mass.....	89,336	72,648,640.00	100 %	72,648,640.00	16,000.00	4,501.32	20,501.32
Peoria, Ill.....	66,950	20,548,876.00	33 1/3 %	61,646,628.00	17,664.44	1,831.91	19,496.35
St. Joseph, Mo.....	77,403	37,743,520.00	60 %	62,958,600.00	21,000.00		21,000.00
Springfield.....	88,926	119,081,778.00	100 %	119,081,778.00	46,012.04	3,449.00	49,461.04
Tacoma.....	83,743	69,939,177.00	60 %	116,565,295.00	26,425.76	733.46	27,159.22
Averages.....							

# TICS FROM ELEVEN SMALLER CITIES

Library Income from All Other Sources, Except Endowments. 1910.	Library Income from All Sources, Except Endowments. 1910.	Rate of Levy in Mills in 1910, Based on Assessed Valuation.	Rate of Levy in Mills in 1910, Based on Valuation of 100 %.	Rate of Levy in Mills Based on Valuation of 100%, Which Would Produce Total Income from All Sources, Except En- dowments. 1910.	Income per Capita, Except from En- dowments. 1900.	Income per Capita, Except from En- dowment. 1910.	Circulation for Home Use per Capita. 1900.	Circulation for Home Use per Capita. 1910.	Income per Circula- tion. 1910.
Fines etc. not reported. \$1,720.12 683.05  500.00 4,501.32 1,831.91  3,449.00 733.46	\$23,500.00 13,637.04 15,335.36 17,355.00 15,050.00 10,500.00 20,501.32 19,496.35 21,000.00 49,461.04 27,159.22	(Lump sum) .44(?) .4 .33½ .628 .5 .22(?) (lump sum) .4 .38 .5	.44 .11 .33½ .238 .5 .22 .28 .33 .38 .22	.505 .12 .333 .238 .525 .282 .311 .33 .415 .232	1.05 .208 .19  .39  .13 .28  .46 .15	.84 .38 .19 .236 .226 .334 .229 .291 .271 .556 .32	5.24 1.35 1.20 No library in 1900 2.7 3.30  2.99  2.6 1.53	6.175 3.6 2.25 1.85 2.8 2.88 2.59 3.09 2.6 5.9 2.66	.132 .106 .087 .131 .082 .116 .088 .094 .101 .093 .122
.....	.....	.....	.304	.329	.357¼	.355	2.61	3.259	.105

turn on the investment. If the profits are less than they should be, considering the volume of business, an investigation of the different departments follows with a view to reduction in costs. There is no absolute test to a library's efficiency. Comparative study of work accomplished and cost of maintenance must be our chief resources. In making comparisons of work, circulation is by no means the only test, for much of the work and expenditure of libraries is devoted to other fields, such as reference work and reading rooms. But it is still a fact that comparative statistics of reference work and reading room attendance are too inaccurate to form a basis for comparison. Neither is the number of card holders as yet much of a test, as the life of the cards varies altogether too much. It remains true then that statistics of circulation are the best *comparative* test we have of work accomplished. Unfortunately, even circulation statistics are not strictly comparable, so great is the divergence in methods of counting.

Next in importance to the adoption of some good definite system of accounting it seems to me that the American library association should adopt some standard system for counting circulation statistics. Varying rules in regard to the loaning of books for two weeks or four weeks, the counting of renewals, seven-day books, counting circulation of books loaned to schools, clubs, etc., are merely some of the reasons why accurate comparison is so difficult. However, in order to come to any conclusion at all, we must find some basis of comparison if it is only approximate.

In collecting some statistics of library support and use in the United States, I tried to get returns from each of the 51 cities which has more than 100,000 population, according to the census of 1910. Counting Allegheny, Brooklyn, and Queens Borough separately from Pittsburgh and New York, there are in all 54 such cities; three of them have no public libraries, and from 19 others insufficient data was obtained to make comparison possible. I was also able to secure figures from 11 cities,

ranging in population from 27,000 to 90,000. To get a common basis of comparison for appropriations, I reduced the assessed valuation of property in all the cities to a 100 per cent valuation, ascertained what millage on these property values produced the income for 1910 from taxes, even if appropriations were made in a lump sum, and what millage would have produced the total income for the year 1910 including income from dog licenses, police court fines, library fines, etc., but excluding income from endowments, because comparatively few public libraries have more than very small endowments, and even in such cases the interest is usually spent for the purchase of certain classes of books, for which the library would, without the endowments, spend but little of its own appropriations.

In the group of large cities the rate of levy in mills which produced the income from taxes in 1910 averaged .218 of a mill, and the rate of levy which would have produced the total income, except from endowments, averaged .26 of a mill. The income per capita averaged 17.8 cents in 1900, and 29 cents in 1910, an increase of 62 per cent. The circulation per capita in 1900 averaged 1.617, and in 1910 averaged 2.187, an increase of 35 per cent.

It is interesting to note that in 1910 the average expenditure for each book circulated was 13.3 cents (of course you remember that for purposes of comparison we are considering only circulation, and disregarding entirely reference work). The corresponding averages in small cities are interesting. I venture to read the list of these 11 cities:

Brookline (Mass.), Cedar Rapids, Duluth, Elizabeth, Erie, Jackson (Mich.), Lynn, Peoria, St. Joseph (Mo.), Springfield (Mass.), Tacoma (Wash.).

The rate of levy in mills which produced the income from taxes in 1910 (based on a valuation of 100 per cent) averaged .304 of a mill, and the rate of levy which would have produced the total income except from endowments averaged .329 of a mill. The income per capita averaged 35.7 cents in 1900, and 35.5 cents in 1910 (practically

the same), but the circulation per capita increased from an average of 2.61 in 1900 to 3.259 in 1910, or 25 per cent. The average expenditure for each book circulated in 1910 was 10.5 cents. In 1910 the small cities received an average income per capita of 22 per cent more than the larger cities, and had an average per capita circulation of 49 per cent more than the larger cities. As showing the very distinct connection between income and circulation, it may be noted that in the two groups of cities, the one which has the largest per capita income (Brookline) also has the largest per capita circulation, and the one which has the smallest per capita income has the second smallest per capita circulation.

Unfortunately, I could not obtain sufficient data to complete accurate comparative statistics of increases in appropriations for schools and libraries. It is I think approximately correct to say that in 1910 appropriations for schools averaged about 15 or 16 times those for libraries, but the percentage of increase since 1900 was greater for libraries. According to the Census Bureau, in the 148 largest cities of the United States, from 1902 to 1907, the per capita expenditures for the police departments increased 10 per cent; for fire departments 21 per cent; for schools 23 per cent; for libraries and museums 37 per cent. From these figures it seems evident that the per capita expenditures for libraries have increased more rapidly than those for any other department of municipal activity.

In conclusion, may I venture the opinion based on the comparative statistics studied, that the only way in which a library may be *sure* of continuously progressive support in proportion to growth of population and increase of library needs, is to secure either by state law or city charter a certain minimum millage of the annual tax levy, such minimum to be adequate for at least the essential needs of an efficient library, and to be determined in the first place by the amount needed to reach the present population, and by the necessary modifications of property val-

ues, character of population, plan and number of library buildings, etc. Such a millage carefully determined will increase the library revenues each year, as the wealth of the community and its consequent ability to spend increases. At present the average rate which will produce our library incomes is approximately .3 of one mill on the dollar, reckoning on the basis of 100 per cent valuation. It is safe to say that this average rate is too small, for the inadequately supported libraries are in the majority.

The CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Carr here again takes the chair.) I think we owe a great deal to Mr. Hopper for the presentation of this most interesting paper. Few except those who have done this kind of work realize the amount of labor he must have put into that paper. I have no doubt it will be a great help to us in the future, and further suggestions in that line will amplify the results to be derived therefrom.

We have with us to-day Professor ARTHUR H. CHAMBERLAIN of the University of California, who comes to us as the accredited representative of the National Education Association. I now have great pleasure in introducing Prof Chamberlain.

#### INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF THE LIBRARY AS AN EDUCATIONAL FACTOR

On the fourth day of July and one year short of three quarters of a century ago the first real apostle of popular education in this country wrote in his journal: "The people who speak to me on the subject of my Secretaryship seem to think that there is more dignity or honor or something in being President of the Senate, than to be Missionary of Popular Education. If the Lord will prosper me for ten years, I will show them what way the balance of honor lies. But this is not a matter to be done sleeping."<sup>1</sup> And on October twentieth, seventy one years later, four months before his death, a great soul said: "How do

<sup>1</sup>Horace Mann's Journal. See Hubbell, Horace Mann. p. 81.